

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above identified patent application is hereby respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-4, 6, 10, and 13-16 have been amended. Claims 1-17 remain in the case.

The applicant appreciated the thoroughness of the review by Examiner James R. Harvey.

A petition and Fee for Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and payment thereof for a one-month extension is attached hereto.

Drawings

(Office Action pages 2-3)

The drawings were objected to for various reasons, such as including the legend, "Prior Art", improper cross-hatching, or a missing element number(s).

A new set of corrected drawings figures 1-5 are enclosed, which are believed to remedy all drawing

objections. This submission is a bona-fide effort to satisfy all of the requirements of the Examiner. If any error has not been corrected to the satisfaction of the Examiner, it is inadvertent. Please notify the undersigned if there is any remaining drawing objection still requiring correction.

Accordingly, the objections are believed to be overcome and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

(Office Action pages 3-5)

The claims have been amended, via a bona-fide effort to more positively recite the claimed structures and satisfy all of the requirements of the Examiner. Accordingly, the objections are believed to be overcome and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 USC 112

(Office Action pages 5-6)

The rejections have been corrected as part of the preceding objections. Accordingly, the rejections are

believed to be overcome and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 USC 102 and 103

(Office Action pages 6-12)

The device of Frommer et al. includes a contact spring that is punched out of flat sheet metal. (See Frommer, column 1, lines 11-13). His invention uses only flat sheet metal and attempts to bulge the end to improved the contact surface. (See Frommer, column 1, lines 34-38).

Therefore, Frommer et al., addresses an entirely different problem. While he wants to improve contact at the tip of the contact spring, he does not teach nor suggest a remedy for axial misalignment of the pin and center axis of the tines (socket) during insertion.

In fact, his invention would fail utterly to provide contact if such misalignment were to occur in a plane that is perpendicular with respect to his contact springs.

Using his FIG. 1, it is apparent that the contact heads 2 or 2' would make contact with a pin that is axially misaligned left to right, with respect to the drawing

figure. However, if the misalignment were to occur perpendicular to the above, namely in and out of the paper, then it is possible for a misaligned pin to pass entirely by the contact head 2, 2' and avoid contact entirely. See **Attachment A** at end of this amendment for a crude sketch that illustrates this condition, in exaggeration.

All original base claims have included the recitation of the tines extending radially away from a center. Radially defines radius which takes into account the need to accommodate axial misalignment in any direction.

In order to promote prosecution, this limitation has been further amended to also recite, "wherein said plurality of tines are adapted to contact a pin during its insertion when an axial misalignment occurs in any direction between a center longitudinal axis of said pin and a center longitudinal axis of said plurality of tines".

Accordingly, the instant claims provide contact between the tine and the pin regardless of which direction the axial misalignment occurs. This provides a substantial improvement over the prior art, providing low insertion force with misaligned pins.

For example, the specification discusses in the background, how a plurality of pins are forced into misalignment when rubber cures and contracts, for example. The instant invention, as claimed, allows for contact to occur between the pins and the tines, regardless of which direction the misalignment occurs. One pin can have misalignment in one direction and another pin can have misalignment in yet a different direction and contact between the pin and the tine is still assured. Additionally, the claimed structures allow for space to accommodate the misalignment which results in low insertion force as well. Either of these benefits is substantial in nature. Together, they provide an especially substantive improvement over the prior art.

The device of Frommer et al., cannot accommodate axial misalignment in any (i.e., radial) direction. Accordingly, it does not provide the unexpected benefits of the instant invention, as claimed. Therefore, it is well-believed that Frommer et al., cannot anticipate the instant invention, as claimed.

Accordingly, the rejections are believed to be overcome and reconsideration of claims 1-17 is respectfully requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure has been reviewed by the undersigned, but is deemed no more relevant than the applied references.

As all remaining claims 1-17 appear to be in condition of allowance, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested, and a notice of allowance is courteously urged at the earliest time.

The applicant appreciates the opportunity to communicate by telephone with the Examiner, or the Examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley, if necessary. Please continue to direct all correspondence to the correspondence address and telephone as shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'R. Rinne', followed by the date '10/25/04' written in a similar cursive style.

Risto A. Rinne, Jr.
Reg. # 37,055

2173 East Francisco Blvd.
Suite E
San Rafael, CA 94901

1-415-457-6933

Attachment A

